

MINUTES – JANUARY 17, 2012

The Caswell County Board of Commissioners met in regular session at the Historic Courthouse in Yanceyville, North Carolina at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 17, 2012. Members present: Nathaniel Hall, Chairman, Cathy W. Lucas, Vice-Chair, William E. Carter, Jeremiah Jefferies, Gordon G. Satterfield and Kenneth D. Travis. Also present: Kevin B. Howard, County Manager, Brian Ferrell, County Attorney, and Angela Evans representing The Caswell Messenger. Paula P. Seamster, Clerk to the Board, recorded the minutes.

MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER

Chairman Hall opened the meeting with a Moment of Silent Prayer.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to approve the Agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

Ms. Amanda Whitaker came before the Board and made the following statement:

“Good evening. The purpose of this public hearing is for the citizens of Caswell County to receive input basically on several different programs that the Department of Commerce Division of Community Investment and also that HUD have available. The programs are as follows and I will kind of give you a brief overview on each one. This is just an informational session. It is not to show that the county is applying for any one of these programs in particular. It is just to show that the county may want to apply for these programs in the future. There are several different categories of programs. The first one is the North Carolina Catalyst Program and this includes several different types of activities: housing and home ownership. Public facilities and non-housing activities which could be parks or any kind of recreation and small projects of that nature. Infrastructure improvements projects which could be for the implementation of water or sewer lines. Infrastructure hook up projects would be to hook up residents to an existing water or sewer line. The economic development program would assist small, local businesses that are looking to expand or if a new business was looking to come to Caswell County. The scattered site housing project would assist residents throughout the county in housing rehabilitation or relocation if necessary. All of these programs are going to benefit folks who are in the low to moderate income. That is one of the main goals of HUD and also the Department of Commerce CDBG programs. I will be glad to answer any questions if there are any.”

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis that the Board enter into a public hearing to receive comments regarding the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hall asked if there was anyone who would like to speak at this time.

Commissioner Satterfield asked “Ms. Whitaker how much money is involved in this Community Development Block Grant?” Ms. Whitaker responded “The state gets an allotment from HUD each year. I am not sure what will be their allotment for the 2012 year. Each particular program carries a different amount and each program that you apply for may be different for a particular county or a particular project. The scattered site program is a program that carries the same amount each time it comes around. It is a three year cycle and it is a \$400,000 grant. Infrastructure really depends upon the project. Infrastructure hook up is basically a \$75,000 grant. The economic development program is dependent upon the needs of that particular company and it is usually a company who receives other grants from the state. The catalyst program carries several different activities so it would be dependent upon the project as well.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Who are you affiliated with?” Ms. Whitaker responded “I am with Hobbs, Upchurch and Associates.” Commissioner Lucas continued “So you are not from the Department of Commerce?” Ms. Whitaker responded “No.” Commissioner Lucas asked “Are we actually in a public hearing to secure the funds for this grant?” Ms. Whitaker responded “No, these are just the different programs that are available. The Department of Commerce requires that each county every year if they intend to apply for these programs hold a public hearing for their intent and if you do choose to apply for one of these programs then you would actually hold a public hearing for that specific program stating what activity you are doing, how much the grant is going to be and exactly what the program is going to be. This is just the first general public hearing that is required by the Department of Commerce. You are not saying your intent for any one program. You are just stating that you may want to apply for these programs in the future.” Commissioner Lucas continued “And you are here representing Hobbs, Upchurch?” Ms. Whitaker responded “Yes.” Commissioner Lucas asked “Are we under contract with them for that now?” Mr. Howard responded “This is something that they do free for us because they have handled our other grants they come in and do this public hearing for us just to answer any questions that anybody may have. When we do the grants we have to pay fees for administration. You cannot pick someone ahead of time. You have to go through the process.”

Chairman Hall declared the Public Hearing as closed.

PUBLIC HEARING – 2012 – 2013 Community Transportation Program

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis that the Board enter into a public hearing to receive comments on the Community Transportation Program. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Melissa Williams, CATS Director, came before the Board and made the following statement:

“I am here tonight for a public hearing for the Caswell County Area Transportation System on completing the Community Transportation grant application for the fiscal year 2012-2013. It is due by January 27th. We are applying for \$111,079 in administrative costs and we are requesting \$71,168 in capital which is for vehicles and we are also replacing one computer. The total project is \$182,247 that we will be requesting from NCDOT for the Community Transportation grant. Also tonight besides the public hearing we need to approve the resolution for the Community Transportation Program.”

Commissioner Satterfield asked “The \$23,780 local share, what is your source for that?” Ms. Williamson responded “It is our enterprise funds.” Commissioner Satterfield continued “It is in your enterprise funds. That is monies gathered through local ridership or what?” Ms. Williamson responded “It is a combination of rider’s fares and also what we have made in revenues.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “What is the additional administrative cost for?” Ms. Williamson responded “It pays for salaries. It pays on health insurance, for vehicle insurance, for computer supplies, office supplies, for the leasing of our copier, fax and scanner. It is a whole list of things we are eligible for and we are capped off at that amount.” Commissioner Lucas continued “So the salary would be yours?” Ms. Williamson responded “And half of Ms. Rainey’s.”

Commissioner Jefferies asked “Is there any way for Social Services or Ms. Anderson over the transportation, sometimes she runs short on money, can she get some help from this grant?” Ms. Williamson responded “Not from this particular grant. But the next one I am going to present will touch on what you are talking about.”

Chairman Hall asked if there were any questions from the public. Chairman Hall declared the Public Hearing as closed.

Commissioner Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to approve the resolution for the 2012-2013 Community Transportation Program grant. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING – 2012 – 2014 TARGETED TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies that the Board enter into a public hearing to receive comments on the Targeted Transit Assistance Program. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Williamson stated “We are applying for the Target Transit Assistance Program application specifically Section 5310 which is for the elderly and disabled program. This grant is also due by January 27th. The objective of these funds is to provide transportation services that meet the special needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities to who mass transportation services are unavailable, insufficient or inappropriate. This particular grant is a two year grant. This is the first time we have applied for this grant. This particular grant has just become available for transit systems to start applying for it. We are requesting \$20,000. I spoke with the Department of Social Services, Lisa Anderson and Dianne Moorefield and with Donna Kopeck at the Senior Center to see what was the target amount that we see that we need to help to provide more

transportation for the elderly and disabled. These are the particular funds that we do tend to run short on. Because of state cut backs, we did not get the supplemental funds that we have gotten before through RAOP because they cut that out for all transit systems. We are kind of hoping to alleviate some of that if we are able to get this grant. This will allow the county to provide more services to the elderly and disabled for medical and dialysis transportation. Like I said, I did discuss this with all three of them to try to figure out how much they were running into on the shortfall every year. This is the amount we came up with. There is a local match of \$2,000. We will be using the RAOP E & D funds that we get as the match for that. This does not take away from that particular grant whatsoever. We are already providing those services anyway and this will allow us to provide more of these types of services.”

Chairman Hall asked if there were any questions on this program. Chairman Hall declared the Public Hearing as closed.

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to approve the resolution for the Targeted Transit Assistance Program. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Hall opened the floor for public comments. With no public comments Chairman Hall declared Public Comments to be closed.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A HSA PLAN

Mr. Mark Browder stated “Good evening, thank you for having me again. We were here in December and we went over some details about adding a health savings account plan to the county’s health insurance. Why I am back tonight is to see if there were any questions coming out of that meeting and to see if there is any further information needed and to get approval to add that as an option to the health insurance plan.”

Commissioner Satterfield asked “Mr. Manager what is your recommendation on this HSA plan?” Mr. Howard responded “My recommendation would be to go forward with it as proposed. We have been talking about it on the staff level for two or three years now. This looks like a good year to do this. We are not expecting an increase in our current plan and we can offer this as an alternative on top of the plan we already offer the employees.” Commissioner Satterfield continued “How much problem is it going to create with our staff, if any?” Mr. Howard responded “None, very minimal. The accounts are not handled on a county staff level. They are handled by an outside agency. We don’t handle the HSA account in house.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Do we have an estimate on how many employees are interested at this point?” Mr. Howard responded “No, we needed to know if you would be interested before we talked to the employees about this. I have mentioned it at department head meetings but not on the employee level yet.”

Chairman Hall asked “Is there a minimum of employees it would take to make this workable?” Mr. Browder responded “Typically what we see and we have about 15 HSA clients, typically

participation starts out small and it grows over time as employees become more comfortable with it. To answer your question, no, just a handful of employees would be sufficient.”

Commissioner Satterfield asked “Mr. Manager what is the initial cost of this program to the county?” Mr. Howard responded “The way we have it figured is there is no additional cost on what we are currently paying now. What we are going to offer employees is the savings we have...” Mr. Browder added “In the current plan, in the structure and the expectation of the current renewal plan should be very good. This is going to be offered as an option for the current employees with the expectation that there will be no additional cost in county funding. Our hope is that it will actually decrease dependent cost for county employees. This is one of the advantages that will come out of this. Before we can get the actual cost we need your approval to move forward.” Mr. Howard stated “What we are looking at doing is the county offering the \$750 to go into the HSA account from the savings we will receive on the cost per employee per month. So over the year we would expect to save in excess of \$750 per employee. We would put that \$750 in that account to encourage participation. Long term it should show a reduction in our healthcare or insurance cost.”

Commissioner Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Satterfield to adopt the HSA plan as an option to the county healthcare program.

Commissioner Lucas asked “When would it be implemented?” Mr. Browder responded “July 1, 2012. The communication would be in the spring for the employees.”

Upon a vote of the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS BUDGET AMENDMENT REQUEST

Mr. Richard Morreale, Board of Elections Director, came before the Board and made the following statement:

“Good evening lady and gentlemen. I want to thank you for putting us on the agenda due to the urgency of this request. I am Richard Morreale and I am the chairman of the Board of Elections. I come before you because Mary Jo Henderson, our director, is retiring June 30th of this year or earlier if she can get out. We will need a full time employee to replace her. We will also need an overlap of employment and training of that employee. If we would have known this we would have put it in the original budget for this year. Our existing part time employee may be interested in this job. We have a part time employee who has been doing a really good job and she may be interested but we will need to interview other people. In addition to that we have currently exhausted our part time budget for this year. I will go over the figures with you in just a second, you will see where we initially put a figure and it got cut. We have been frugal with it but it just has not lasted. Of course, there is no money in the budget for overlap in training for another full time employee. Some of the activity that we have to go through, the activity in training required over the next six months is the training in the state elections and the information management system (SEIMS). Redistricting must be reflected in SEIMS. The notification process for the voters in SEIMS. Of course, not only does the information have to be put in but we have to train the new person in how to do that. We have the bi-annual national

change of address changes. We have to prepare and submit a grant for the Help America Vote Act. We need to set up the primary and the second primary in SEIMS. We need to handle the new campaign finance issues and support the candidate filing period. The coding of ballots with district relations. We need the logic and accuracy testing of the voting machines. The processing of civilian, overseas and military absentee ballot request. Administering the one-stop voting. Confirming and training of the precinct officials. Attending board meetings, registrations and general office management and if we have to add on to that a relocation of our office. So our supplementary budget request for the remainder of 2011-2012 is \$29,500. I am sure you have the form that shows where the money is going to be needed. Let me explain each one of these. The first one is we would like to, Mary Jo Henderson, our director, has not had a salary adjustment in approximately eight years other than the COLA adjustments which was about three years ago. She has done a great job over the last eight or ten years and what we would really like to do is to give her an increase until the end of June and that would be about \$4,000. Of course, we have vacation pay out for Mary Jo, which is about \$4,900. We have currently exhausted, as I said, the original budget for part time help and we need part time help quite regularly in the office when there is something that really needs to be done. There may be an update needed with SEIMS or something like that and we can give that to a part time person. We are asking for an additional \$4,000. I don't think we are going to need \$4,000 but we are asking for it to cover so in case we need it we don't have to come back. We would like to hire a full time employee at Grade 17 to start. The urgency to seeing this design is because of the training that has to take place and stuff. We would really like to start this person on approximately February 1st or sometime early in February, at an initial salary of \$12.00 an hour, \$24,960 a year. What we need is to last us until the end of June is \$10,400. The FICA, retirement, health insurance is all listed there and it covers the increase on Mary Jo and the new employee. We have put in \$1,000 for travel for the new employee to attend the state meetings and training sessions. I am happy to answer any questions but because I am new I may have to turn to Mary Jo to have her to answer the questions."

Commissioner Lucas asked "If I could just get an explanation on the salary line items currently. I am concerned that we don't have the part time money for the remainder of the budget year but the full time salaries in line 126, you said the additional amount requested is \$10,400?" Mr. Morreale responded "Yes." Commissioner Lucas continued "You currently have \$24,960 is that right?" Mr. Morreale responded "The \$24,960 would be the current salary so after June 30th we will reflect it in the budget for the remainder of the year." Commissioner Lucas asked "What is currently in that now, in that line item?" Mr. Morreale responded "Nothing. That is why we need \$10,400." Commissioner Lucas continued "Is that a new line item?" Mr. Morreale responded "That is a new line item. That is for the person we want to hire to replace Mary Jo and to have in place for training." Commissioner Lucas stated "That answers my questions."

Commissioner Satterfield asked "Mr. Morreale if you could tell me \$3,400 is in part time salaries, what was requested there and what was spent the previous year in part time salaries?" Ms. Mary Jo Henderson responded "I don't have that with me." Commissioner Satterfield continued "I don't remember us cutting the budget that much." Ms. Henderson responded "It was in there." Commissioner Satterfield asked "Do you remember Mr. Manager." Mr. Howard responded "I don't right off the top of my head, no sir. It very well could have been cut at staff level before it came to you." Commissioner Lucas stated "That was my thought that it was cut

before it got to the Board.” Mr. Morreale stated “It was put in the budget but it was cut.” Commissioner Satterfield continued “I was just wondering how much we normally spend in a fiscal year in part time salaries.” Mr. Morreale responded “Ms. Henderson can help you with that.” Ms. Henderson responded “I should know it but I did not pull the previous budget. I know it was far more than this. It was probably around \$11,000.” Commissioner Satterfield asked “How much more do you think, Mr. Morreale, you will need for this year. You said that you did not think you would need \$4,000. How much do you think you will really need?” Mr. Morreale responded “I would like to get \$4,000. I think if we could get the \$3,400 which would get us up to \$6,800 for the year which is what I think is less than what we had originally asked for. Although I don’t have the figure with me I remember talking with Mary Jo earlier.”

Commissioner Carter asked “You want to hire somebody to take over Mary Jo’s job and she is going to stay until June 30th. How long will this person be in training with Mary Jo?” Mr. Morreale responded “Until July 1st.” Commissioner Carter continued “And you are going to need money for a part time person also?” Mr. Morreale responded “During that time, that is right. At the end of June we will be putting it in the budget for next year to cover this new person and some part time monies.” Commissioner Carter continued “My question is and what I am wondering is what you have proposed is enough to cover an additional full time person and a part time person?” Mr. Morreale responded “Well the \$10,400 is certainly enough and the \$4,000 for the part time is enough. I think both of those line items are enough.”

Chairman Hall stated “Our part timers normally work during elections?” Mr. Morreale responded “Yes, during elections and during that time of peak work that comes in.” Chairman Hall continued “So we know or we think we will have at least one primary this fiscal year.” Mr. Morreale responded “We will have a primary and maybe a second primary.”

Commissioner Carter asked “Where will this money come from?” Mr. Howard responded “You may be looking at fund balance to cover it.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Where are we with the fund balance currently?” Mr. Howard responded “I know with the current audit, the last fiscal year we added \$190,000 to \$200,000 to our fund balance. We did budget \$200,000 this year for the capital projects.” Commissioner Lucas continued “Around what percentage?” Mr. Howard responded “Around 23 or 24%.”

Commissioner Satterfield stated “I would like to hear from the county manager on his recommendation on this. It has some items in it that I am a little worried about.” Mr. Howard responded “I guess we can look at the expenses that are going out and we will probably not spend everything that is listed here. Like he said if she can retire earlier then you would have a couple of months in savings in her salary to go back and cover some of these costs. Same way with the part time. The way I look at it is they are hiring another full time person to be in there. They will need the part time probably during elections and one-stop but also part time to help cover the office if somebody needed to be out like they do right now.” Mr. Morreale added “What I would say is we would certainly handle this additional budget prudently.”

Commissioner Travis asked “Is there anybody that works in that office interested in this job?” Mr. Morreale responded “We have one that is a part time person that has been working with us

that may be interested in the job. We were also looking at having to advertise it on the website and on the bulletin board and that kind of thing. The person that has been working part time I think would like to take it as full time.” Commissioner Travis continued “It looks like to me if she can handle the job it would be cheaper to hire someone who has some experience than it would be to hire someone to totally train.” Chairman Hall responded “Let’s not jump the gun on the process. There is a hiring process that the county must follow. I think we have two policy issues that we need to address before we start dealing with the money issue, so we might as well address them head on. The first is the raise and the second policy issue is the start date if we so decide to hire the second person. We have to deal with those issues before we decide how much money we will ask staff to start looking for.”

Commissioner Carter asked “You said you want to increase Mary Jo’s salary \$4,000?” Mr. Morreale responded “Yes, from now until the first of July.”

Commissioner Travis asked “How many people, that were about to retire, have we done this for?” Mr. Howard responded “No one since I have been here. I can’t speak prior to that.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “The question was these numbers may not be accurate if the training is done sooner, is that correct? This could be less, is what I am saying?” Mr. Morreale responded “If the training is done quicker Mary Jo can leave earlier than the end of June.” Commissioner Lucas stated “But there is no way to know that.” Mr. Morreale responded “The reason we want this as early as we can to hire somebody is to try to cut down on the back end.”

Commissioner Satterfield stated “Mr. Chairman, I think we need to go ahead and plan for Ms. Henderson’s retirement and go ahead to hire someone. I think the only thing that is really in question is perhaps the amount in retirement and FICA and salary adjustment for Ms. Henderson, whether the Board will grant that or not. The rest of the items, seems like to me, we have to go ahead and move forward on that.” Chairman Hall responded “That is why I indicated that we had two policy issues we had to decide and that is one of them. What is this Board’s pleasure if you understand what two policy issues I am referring to?”

Commissioner Satterfield stated “Mr. Chairman even though I understand, I know that Ms. Henderson has done a wonderful job along with two hundred and some other employees employed by the county and they have not had a COLA in the last three years and I understand that but unless we are going to change the policy from what it is now and start making adjustments for everyone who is going to retire we can’t just single out one employee. The policy now is not to do it unless we change our policy. It is a mute point unless we want to make a policy change.” Chairman Hall asked “Do you want to make a motion?” Commissioner Satterfield responded “There is no motion to it. I feel like that is our policy now unless someone wants to make a motion that we do, do it. I do think if we do, do that we have to look at all the employees and not just one employee.”

Commissioner Lucas stated “Chairman Hall just a comment, I think it does happen within departments by title changes at time of retirement. It might not be a policy but I think it does happen in some departments throughout county government. I think it does happen.” Commissioner Satterfield responded “I don’t know of any case of this happening. It may have

happened before, I don't know." Mr. Howard responded "That would be considered a promotion within the department and I cannot think of that happening within the six months of someone retiring. I can't remember that happening since the time I have been here either. I understand what you are talking about."

Chairman Hall stated "If there is no action on that and that is a policy decision that has been made by this Board. The next item is the part time salary. The policy decision there is at what point do we want to bring a new person in. That will determine the dollars we want to try to appropriate. I think what was presented to us is as of February." Mr. Morreale responded "As of February 1st. We really need to have someone on as quickly as possible."

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to accept the recommendation of the Board of Elections and to bring someone on by February 1st if possible. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Carter asked "Mr. Chairman what was the amount approved? Was this for the full time and the part time?" Chairman Hall responded "No the only thing we have approved is the \$4,000 for a part time person and the benefits attached to it."

Commissioner Jefferies asked "Will this person be allowed to work more than 20 hours per week?" Chairman Hall responded "It is my understanding that this part time person would be working like full time during the training period." Mr. Morreale added "The person that will be hired to replace Mary Jo will be working full time. That is the line item for \$10,400. During that time we may need part time help." Chairman Hall stated "We approved the part time salary for a person to come in for the first primary, second primary, etc." Mr. Morreale responded "That is right."

Chairman Hall stated "Mr. Satterfield your motion was..." Commissioner Satterfield responded "My motion was to approve the recommendation of the Board of Elections." Chairman Hall asked "For what though?" Commissioner Satterfield responded "All of this that is within our policy. To hire someone by February 1st to replace Ms. Henderson, to increase the part time salary \$4,000, and of course the FICA and retirement will have to be adjusted because those figures are not accurate." Chairman Hall stated "Well I misunderstood you there. I thought we were just approving the part time salary. So you are talking about the part time salary and the full time person starting February." Commissioner Satterfield responded "Yes." Chairman Hall stated "So to answer your question on what we just approved, we approved the \$14,400 for the part time and full time salary." Commissioner Carter stated "What he was saying was the Board of Elections recommendation was for \$29,500." Chairman Hall responded "That was not in our policy so he omitted the \$4,036." Commissioner Satterfield added "And you will have to adjust the FICA and retirement because those two figures are not right." Chairman Hall stated "So basically it is the \$4,000 and \$10,400 and fringes as appropriated?" Commissioner Satterfield responded "That is right."

Mr. Morreale asked "Is the vacation payout for \$4,975 included in that?" Commissioner Satterfield responded "We have to pay that." Mr. Howard added "It is based upon the vacation she has accrued until the end of her employment." Mr. Morreale asked "I understand that is part

of it. The \$4,000 has been approved. The \$10,400 for the full time person who will work with Mary Jo to be trained and the FICA, retirement and health insurance and the \$1,000 for travel? This person will have to go to Raleigh for training.” Chairman Hall responded “That is my understanding that this was Commissioner Satterfield’s motion. Is that correct Mr. Satterfield?” Commissioner Satterfield responded “That is correct.”

Chairman Hall asked “Does that cover everything?” Mr. Morreale responded “That covers everything except the increase in salary.” Chairman Hall responded “That is correct and there was no action taken on that. It was taken out of the equation.” Mr. Morreale stated “So that gives us about \$24,000, I think. Thank you very much.”

LONG TERM PLANNING GRANT APPLICATION

Ms. Rhonda Griffin, County Librarian, came before the Board and made the following statement:

“I would like approval to submit the attached grant for a consultant to come in and prepare a five year plan for the library. A library plan is a requirement of state aid. Normally this is done by the regional library system. This will be the first time we get to do this as a county library. The state library does have a grant that allows a consultant to come in and prepare a five year long range plan to address specific concerns that we have including space constraints that we can then use and build upon for our future five year plan. The plan is in front of you. There is a specific list of consultants that must be selected from. That is a requirement from the state. The one we selected is one that is familiar with our library system and is the closest to Caswell County. There is no matching requirement.”

Commissioner Satterfield asked “Is there any local money required for that grant application?” Ms. Griffin responded “No sir, it is all state.”

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to the Library’s Long-Range Planning Grant Application. The motion carried unanimously.

JORDAN LAKE WATERSHED NEW DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Brian Collie, County Planner, came before the Board and made the following statement:

“Good evening commissioners. As you all know the state mandate has been proposed upon us in the Jordan Lake Watershed area in Caswell County which encompasses about 35 square miles of the southwestern portion of the county. Currently we are in the works for developing their program for a new development in that area and the best way to sum that up is it is going to be for all development that is going to be disturbing over 1 acre in the watershed area. The developers are going to have to put in certain stormwater best management practices to control stormwater runoff on the property. A draft ordinance has been worked on for the past couple of months by myself and the state. I am trying to figure out what we need to do before submittal. We are really on a time constraint. The county, once this is implemented, is going to have to have an engineer review each permit which is required under this ordinance. Being that we do not have an engineer on staff one would have to be contracted out for this review. In talks with

the planning director in Rockingham County, who is in the same boat as us with these rules for Jordan Lake, they have contracted out an engineer, Mr. Brent Huss, to help write their ordinance for them and submit it to the state to get it approved. Afterwards he will act as their stormwater administrator for the ordinance. Being an engineer for them to review each permit that comes in. We would basically follow the same steps as Rockingham County, Caswell would receive the permits from the applicants and they would review the best management practices for each site. That is the requirement that the state has. I am coming before you tonight, since we are on a time constraint for submitting a draft ordinance to the state for their review, is to propose to allow Mr. Huss, who has done this for Rockingham County, to help us in drafting our ordinance and submit it to the state to get approval. Hopefully after that is done we can work with Mr. Huss or another possible engineer to contract with the county from year to year in reviewing these permits that comes in for that area. In talking with Mr. Huss his fee to write, submit and get approved at state level the Caswell County Jordan Lake New Development Program, his fee would not exceed \$4,250."

Commissioner Lucas asked "Mr. Collie how many ordinances do we currently have that apply to Jordan Lake in Caswell County?" Mr. Collie responded "One, the Jordan Lake Watershed Buffer Ordinance. The Buffer ordinance is different from this. It kind of portrays the current watershed ordinances we have in the county as far as the buffer requirements from any lake or stream or pond and how close you have to stay away from that land disturbing activity." Commissioner Lucas continued "How much area of the county is affected by this?" Mr. Collie responded "Approximately 35 square miles. If you look at the map it is from the Cherry Grove Road south to the county line. It kind of follows the Cherry Grove Road."

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Carter to enter into contract with BHH Engineering to write the Jordan Lake Ordinance for the County and not to exceed \$4,250.

Commissioner Lucas asked "Do we have any development currently ongoing in this area?" Mr. Collie responded "None at this time that would fall under these requirements. We have talked with the state and with Mr. Huss and was told it is directed at Rockingham County. As far as this Jordan Lake Watershed area Caswell County has the smallest portion of land on it, so that is a good thing. At the same time we have to take all the same steps and measures in getting our ordinances and plans in place like everybody else. As far as development in the past few years that will not be affected by this. The last subdivision that was done in that area was about 5 years ago. It will pertain to residential development and commercial development as well." Commissioner Lucas continued "Has the county attorney reviewed this?" Mr. Ferrell responded "The draft ordinance will be prepared. I did review the contract and spoke with Mr. Collie about a pre-audit certificate that needs to go on it, earlier. It is short and to the point and given the amount involved it seems sufficient to move forward with the purposes stated." Commissioner Lucas continued "And there is no set term for this?" Mr. Ferrell responded "There is a deliverable term listed in the agreement." Mr. Collie added "He said that once it was approved he said to give him three weeks to get it finished and submitted to NCDENR."

Upon a vote of the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

RECESS

The Board held a brief recess.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL DIRECTOR SERVICE AGREEMENT

Mr. Barry Lynch, Asst. EMS Director, came before the Board and made the following statement:

“Just to give you a little history about why we are having to get a new medical director. Dr. Stephen Long, which has been our medical director for 20+ years, told us about four months ago that he wanted to step down as our medical director and we have been looking since then. We found Dr. Gina Martin, an emergency room physician, at Morehead Hospital. She has agreed to serve as the medical director. I want to request permission to sign a contract with her to become our medical director for the county.”

Chairman Hall asked “Could we have not used some of our local doctors for this?” Mr. Lynch responded “There are certain restrictions that the state has. They have to be board certified and be willing to take the medical director’s class and so forth. There are guidelines and restrictions the state has. I have asked, I think at the last count I have asked 12 physicians, from all around the area and some in Danville and no one wanted to do it.”

Commissioner Satterfield asked “Were the people at Caswell Family Medical Center contacted Mr. Lynch?” Mr. Lynch responded “Yes I contacted them. I tried to get it approved through the state where we could use a nurse practitioner instead of a physician and they would not let me do that. The physician there told me that he did not have the time nor the desire to do this.”

Commissioner Satterfield continued “The monies that we have currently appropriated for Dr. Long’s services, is the contract the same for this doctor as it was for Dr. Long?” Mr. Lynch responded “No, the contract for Dr. Long was \$6,000 a year, Dr. Martin’s will be \$10,000 a year. We do have it in the budget anticipating that this year we would have to have a new medical director. We had that in the budget for it. She has agreed to be a lot more involved in teaching classes, etc than what Dr. Long did in the past.” Commissioner Satterfield asked “Does she do this in any other counties, the medical director in any other counties?” Mr. Lynch responded “She has been assisting and doing a lot with the Rockingham EMS over the last 10 years but she does not have the official title.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “You said we budgeted for it this year, is that right?” Mr. Lynch responded “Yes ma’am.” Commissioner Lucas continued “So we did not budget \$6,000, we budgeted \$10,000?” Mr. Lynch responded “Yes ma’am and the reason we did that was because Dr. Long had said that he may not want to. He had given us a hint last year so we would be prepared.”

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Satterfield to approve the Emergency Medical Director Services agreement. The motion carried unanimously.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR INMATE HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INMATE
COMMISSARY AND TRUST FUND ACCOUNTING SERVICES AND SPECIFICATIONS
FOR FOOD SERVICES CONTRACT

Sheriff Welch came before the Board and made the following statement:

“Mr. Chairman and members of the Board I am here tonight to continue to keep the Board informed of the processes we are following with the transition team for the new detention facility. One of those processes has been sent to you in the packet in the form of Items 13, 14 and 15. Those are requests for proposals for services for the inmates for the new detention center. If I may, what this is is the schedule for proposals. If you will look at the timeline. One good thing that has been a part of this process and I wanted to recognize Lt. Tony Durden. He is the team coordinator for the transition for the jail. He has been doing a great job. The two consultants have prepared this for us to follow and you will see where the RFPs will be going out and then we will actually have the process that we will follow to gather the information. What I wanted to do was to keep you informed that this is going to be going out. What I would like to do is to request that the Board of Commissioners consider the possibility of doing some work sessions to mirror the work that we are doing with the transition team and to expand on the information that we are gathering and that we continue to work in that direction.”

STATEWIDE MISDEMEANANT CONFINEMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENT

Sheriff Welch stated “Secondly if I may, you were provided with a copy of an agreement pertaining to the Statewide Misdemeanant Confinement Program. I come in front of you tonight to request that the Board of Commissioners approve entering into this agreement for participation in this program. I would like to entertain any questions you may have at this time.”

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to approve the Statewide Misdemeanant Confinement Program Agreement. The motion carried unanimously.

UPDATE ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE GRANT INVESTIGATION

Chairman Hall stated “We have in our packet, information provided to us from the Sheriff’s office. Sheriff we want to thank you and your staff for what you all did on this grant in which we needed additional information on. I think there is one more question that we need to have answered. We thank you for what your office did. Fellow commissioners, Ms. Lucas, did you have a question? I think there are still some questions in our mind and hopefully the county manager can clear up this on the grant year and certification request that we received.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “My question is I think we have certified the grant year as ’08 but we have not certified it for ’10, there were two separate requests.” Mr. Howard responded “’10 we have not certified that because we have not spent any of those monies.” Commissioner Lucas continued “Here is the letter from Commerce where it is being requested to be certified.” Chairman Hall responded “What he is saying is we have not spent any money yet.” Commissioner Lucas stated “But the selection took place. There were 18 homes selected right?” Mr. Howard responded “Yes ma’am.” Commissioner Lucas continued “The process has been

gone through.” Chairman Hall asked “The selection process?” Commissioner Lucas responded “Yes and that is what is in question on the 2010 grant.” Chairman Hall stated “So we have done the selection process only on the 2010?” Mr. Howard responded “We sent that letter back to the state because we have not spent any of the funds.” Commissioner Lucas stated “But we still have to go through the process. That is what they requested.” Chairman Hall stated “If I understand Ms. Lucas we were requested to certify 2008 and 2010. 2008 we had some field work done by the Sheriff’s department. 2010 we had nothing done. The county manager is telling us we have not spent any money in 2010. Ms. Lucas is telling us that we have done the selection process.” Commissioner Lucas stated “We still need to do the verification.” Chairman Hall continued “So on the selection process I need to look at that form. What are we certifying in terms of selection? That the meeting was held?” Commissioner Lucas responded “It was about the signatures and that the selection committee meeting actually took place in September of 2010.” Mr. Howard responded “I will have to check on the 2010 grant but I think we actually had to use, and I am speaking from memory, the 2010 grant if I am not mistaken we did not do a selection process on it. We will have to verify this but because it was based on the previous process.” Commissioner Lucas stated “Will you have minutes that reflect a selection committee meeting?” Mr. Howard responded “We could not take the applications like we normally do for this process.” Chairman Hall stated “So what we have to do to complete this is #1 if we have done the selection process then we need to confirm how we did the process and we need to have the documentation on how it was done. I think that is the key and the only thing that needs to be done.” Commissioner Lucas added “And the signatures.” Chairman Hall responded “We would not have the signatures yet.” Commissioner Lucas stated “Yes, you would.” Chairman Hall stated “Not before the work is done. You would have signatures on applications.” Commissioner Lucas responded “Yes on the survey needs.” Chairman Hall stated “We will look at the selection process for 2010 and determine how it was done and when it was done.”

WASTE, FRAUD & ABUSE POLICY

Mr. Howard stated “You have in your packets two different policies. In order in your documents you have Policy A, which is the original policy I gave you and after that you have Policy A again with changes in red and the third one is one we actually found in the last two or three weeks for you to look at as another option as well.”

Commissioner Satterfield stated “After reading these things, Mr. Chairman, I think Option B is more precise, condensed and easier to understand than the one we have been working on.” Mr. Howard responded “For what this is worth, Option A came from a different state. We could not find one originally in North Carolina that had been done. Option B comes from a larger county in the state who just put the policy in place.”

Commissioner Carter stated “Mr. Chairman I like Option B.”

Chairman Hall stated “I like the modified Option A.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “I have questions on the one with the red mark-up. On page 223 where it is removed, it says ‘Accepting or seeking anything of material value from vendors or person providing services or materials to the County.’” Mr. Howard responded “There are

actually two things entered in this to deal with that. On page 222, where it says 'Accepting or seeking anything of material value from vendors or persons providing services or material to the County for personal benefit' we felt like that covered everything and took out the other language. We did the same thing on page 222, 'An employee using non-confidential taxpayer information to get a new customers for his/her outside business' we removed that because it says the same thing down at the bottom where it says for personal gain. It is more descriptive than the other language." Chairman Hall stated "So what you are saying is it was duplicated." Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir. I had the same question Ms. Lucas."

Chairman Hall asked "I have a question on page 222, 'Waste – Waste is defined as repeated and/or' and this was added 'harmful'?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir. In our discussions we felt like something on a one time basis may not be considered a waste or a fraud but if it happened twice or three or four times we wanted to add this to make it more descriptive. Let's say wasting paper from printing. On the surface things happen sometimes but if someone continues to waste paper because they keep on printing documents you may want to show that as a waste and they would need to be talked to about that. It does not discount a single act at all but something that may not be considered waste in a single but if it occurs three, four or five times you need to consider that as waste or abuse." Chairman Hall stated "That was my concern."

Commissioner Lucas stated "It is the same application for Abuse. I have a problem with that. Waste is waste and abuse is abuse. I don't think you need further definition." Mr. Howard responded "In discussions with the committee we wanted to be able to address anything that may come up. A one-time waste, fraud, and abuse, whatever that incident may be some things are automatic no matter what it is. Destruction of county property or anything like that would fall under that category but some things may not be in a one-time incident but if it happens several times this would cover that. It is not discounting the one-time act could be waste, fraud or abuse. That is not the intent of it."

Chairman Hall stated "I understand what you are saying, Mr. Manager, but my concern is if I am an employee and I am guilty of this then I would probably argue that since it is not repeated I am okay. I am looking at it from the other side. That is why I have a problem with the word repeated there. I would argue with you at some hearing, at some level, when you started to take action. That is why I have a problem. Personally I would like to see us remove that word repeated. Let's do this, I think we need to deal with first what policy we are going to deal with then make adjustments to that particular policy since we have these options. Tell me the options." Mr. Howard responded "We have Option A, which was the original document. Then you have Option A with the red writing, which is the one we marked up. Then Option B."

Chairman Hall moved, seconded by Commissioner Lucas adopt Option A with the red writing as amended by this Board. The motion carried by a vote of five to one with Commissioner Carter voting no.

Chairman Hall stated "We decided to do Option A with the red. Now it would be appropriate to look at making amendments to it.

Commissioner Lucas moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to amend page 222 under Waste remove 'repeated and/or' and under Abuse remove 'repeated and/or intentional'. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hall moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to accept the Waste, Fraud & Abuse Policy Option A in the red as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hall stated "The only thing we did not decide is the effective date of this policy. Did you have a date in here Kevin?" Mr. Howard responded "No, I would just assume it would be effective the date it was adopted." Chairman Hall stated "So this means that this will be communicated to all county employees immediately."

Commissioner Satterfield asked "Each county employee is going to be instructed in this policy by their supervisor?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes, it will be sent out to their supervisor and a sheet for the employee to sign, like the personnel policy, that they received and understand the policy." Commissioner Satterfield continued "And this will become a part of their personnel jacket?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir." Commissioner Satterfield stated "In that, I know you have talked to employees about abuse of phones and that nature, is that going to be emphasized again as county property?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir. We are actually looking at some cell phone use policies as well that we may bring to the Board later on that should be more specific to those."

Caswell County, North Carolina Fraud, Waste and Abuse Policy

OVERVIEW

The County of Caswell is committed to the safeguarding of public assets and preventing fraud, waste and abuse. All County employees, as public stewards must share in the commitment. County employees, especially supervisors and department heads/elected officials, must be aware of the circumstances, or "red flags", which may potentially lead to fraud. For the purpose of this administrative policy, fraud, waste and abuse are referred to as "fraud".

PURPOSE

Caswell County is committed to the highest standards of moral and ethical behavior by its employees, administrators, and elected officials. The purpose of this policy is to prohibit dishonest acts and/or fraudulent activity and to advise employees, administrators, and elected officials of their responsibility to report suspected fraudulent activity to the appropriate County office.

SCOPE

This policy applies to any fraud, or suspected fraud, involving employees, department heads, officials, consultants, vendors, contractors, and any other parties with a business relationship

with Caswell County. This policy also applies to employees of local boards, agencies and commissions over which the Board has authority to require general policies to be followed.

GOAL

It is the intent of this policy to establish and maintain a fair, ethical, and honest working environment for all County employees, customers, suppliers and anyone else with whom the County has a relationship.

DEFINITIONS

Fraud – Fraud encompasses an array of intentional irregularities and illegal acts characterized by internal or external deception. It can be perpetrated for the benefit of, or to the detriment of, the County; and by persons outside as well as inside the County. Examples of fraud include, but are not limited to the following:

- Stealing, misappropriation of funds, supplies, etc.
- Forgery or unauthorized alteration of any document
- Intentional misrepresentation by County personnel regarding payroll records or the payroll records of others
- Knowingly making a false entry in, or false alteration of a government record
- Making, presenting, or using any record, document, or thing with the knowledge that it is false
- Intentional destruction, concealment, removal or other impairment to the verity, legibility, or availability of a government record
- Processing, selling, or offering to sell a governmental record or a blank governmental record form with the intent that it be used unlawfully, or with the knowledge that it was obtained unlawfully
- Using or claiming to hold an educational degree that is fraudulent, fictitious, or has been revoked, with the intent to obtain employment, promotion, or other benefit
- Credit card abuse or falsification of transaction
- Making a false statement to obtain property, credit, or services
- Fraudulent transfer of a motor vehicle
- Securing execution of a document by deception
- Fraudulent destruction, removal, or concealment of a writing
- Simulating legal process
- Fraudulent use or possession of identifying information without that person's consent
- Stealing an unsigned check or receiving an unsigned check with the intent to use it or sell it

Waste – Waste is defined as harmful or destructive use of property under one's control. Waste may also be referred as the unnecessary incurring of costs as a result of inefficient practices, systems or controls. Examples of waste include, but are not limited to the following:

- Damaging, destroying, or ruining materials or equipment

- Improper maintenance or intentional mistreatment of equipment
- Purchase of unneeded supplies or equipment
- Purchase of goods at inflated prices
- Failure to reuse or recycle major resources or reduce waste generation

Abuse – Abuse refers to violations and circumventions of departmental or County regulations which impair the effective and efficient execution of operations. Some examples of abuse are as follows:

- Using County equipment or supplies to conduct non-County business
- Improper handling or reporting of money or financial transaction
- Profiting by self or others as a result of inside knowledge
- Destruction or intentional disappearance of records, furniture, fixtures or equipment
- Accepting or seeking anything of material value from vendors or persons providing services or material to the County for personal benefit
- Unauthorized use of County resources (computers, software, databases, other information) for non-County purposes
- Abuse of purchase order authority, such as false travel or expense reports
- Use of information gained as County employee for personal gain, such as an employee using non-confidential taxpayer information to get new customers for his/her outside business

DETERRENCE

Deterrence consists of those actions taken to discourage the perpetration of fraud and limit the exposure if fraud does occur. Elected Officials/Department Heads are responsible for the implementation and maintenance of effective internal controls. The Finance Office is responsible for assisting in the deterrence of fraud by examining and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of internal controls.

Fraud, waste and abuse occurs for the following reasons:

1. Poor internal controls, especially disregard for set policies and procedures
2. Management override of internal controls
3. Collusion between employees and/or third parties
4. Poor or non-existing ethical standards
5. Lack of control over staff by their supervisors

“RED FLAGS”

The most frequently cited “red flags” of fraud, waste and abuse are:

1. Changes in an employee’s lifestyle, spending habits or behavior
2. Poorly written or poorly enforced internal controls, procedures, policies or security
3. Irregular / unexplained variances in financial information
4. Inventory shortages

5. Failure to take action on results of internal/external audits or reviews
6. Unusually high expenses or purchases
7. Frequent complaints from customers
8. Missing files
9. Ignored employee comments concerning possible fraud
10. Refusal to leave custody of records during the day by the employee
11. Working excessive overtime and refusing to take vacation time off

FRAUD PREVENTION

The following internal controls should minimize the risks and help prevent fraud, waste, and abuse:

1. Detailed written policies and procedures and adherence to all policies and procedures, especially those concerning documentation and authorization of transactions.
2. Physical security and controlled access over assets such as locking doors and restricting access to certain areas.
3. Proper training of employees
4. Independent review and monitoring of tasks by the department supervisor, such as approval processing of select items.
5. Separation of duties so that no one employee is responsible for a transaction from start to finish
6. Clear lines of authority
7. Conflict of interest statements which are enforced
8. Rotation of duties in positions more susceptible to fraud
9. Ensuring that employees take regular vacations
10. Regular independent audits of areas susceptible to fraud

REPORTING FRAUD

If an employee suspects that fraud is being committed within the County, then the employee should report it to any of the following:

- The immediate supervisor
- Department Head/Elected Official
- County Manager by phone at 336-694-4193 Ext. 105 or via email at khoward@caswellcountync.gov or by mail to PO Box 98, Yanceyville, NC 27379.
- The Fraud Hot Line at 336-694-4193 Ext. 100.

The supervisor, department head/elected official, county manager should immediately report it to the necessary authority.

Any employee that communicates with any of these individuals to report fraud will have the option to remain anonymous. Every attempt will be made to protect the identity of the reporting individual. The County is committed to protecting the employee's identity and confidentiality.

Due to the important yet sensitive nature of the suspected violations, effective professional follow-up is critical. Managers, while appropriately concerned about ‘getting to the bottom’ of such issues, should not in any circumstances perform any investigative or other follow-up steps on their own. All relevant matters, including suspected but unproven matters, should be referred immediately to the Department Head and/or the County Manager.

If members of the public suspect that fraud is being committed within the County, they may report it to the County’s Fraud Hot Line at 336-694-4193 Ext. 100.

RETALIATION

An employee who believes that he or she has experienced retaliation for making a report or assisting in an investigation shall report this as soon as possible to the County Manager at 336-694-4193 Ext. 105.

REPORTING UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR

Employees are encouraged to seek advice from the County Manager when faced with uncertain ethical decisions. The County Manager is responsible for the administration, revision, interpretation, and application of this policy. The policy will be reviewed annually and revised as necessary.

DUTY TO REPORT

Local public officials, County officials, County employees, and all others who are subject to this policy have a duty to report violations of this policy and to cooperate in investigations, inquiries, and hearings conducted by the County. However, a person making false reports shall be subject to disciplinary action if he or she reports information which he or she knows to be false or which he or she discloses with reckless disregard for its truth or falsity.

NO COERCION

No County official or employee shall directly or indirectly use or threaten to use any official authority or any influence in any manner whatsoever, which tends to discourage, restrain, deter, prevent, interfere with, coerce, or discriminate against any person who in good faith reports, discloses, divulges, or provides any facts or information relative to an actual or suspected violation of this policy or other state, federal, or local laws.

CONSEQUENCES

County Department Heads found to have violated this policy will be subject to discipline by the County Manager or appropriate appointing authority, including a written warning or reprimand, suspension, or termination in accordance with the procedures under which a department head may otherwise be disciplined.

County employees found to have violated this policy will be subject to discipline by their department head or elected official regarding violations of this policy, including a written

warning or reprimand, suspension, or termination in accordance with the procedures under which the employee may otherwise be disciplined.

Parties doing business with the County, including vendors, consultants, contractors or their principals and employees, found to have violated this policy will be subject to termination of any business relationship with the County and exclusion from further business opportunities with the County. The Finance Office will maintain a list of affected businesses.

As to any person to this policy or otherwise, the County may make referral of its findings to the appropriate law enforcement authority.

Adopted this 17th day of January, 2012.

S/Nathaniel Hall
Nathaniel Hall, Chairman
Caswell County Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

S/Paula P. Seamster
Paula P. Seamster
Clerk to the Board

COUNTY MANAGER'S REPORT
Pelham Water Tank

Mr. Howard stated "Ms. Seamster has a handout. What that will show is what the tank will look like once they are finished painting it. In your packets you have a copy of the schedule. I know it is kind of hard to read but I will just tell you the completion date for the project now is March 7th. We should be closed out and the tank will be ready to go operational March 7th. March 12th hopefully it will go online. What was handed out is what the water tank will look like. We received that after your packets went out. If you are standing at the Visitors Center you will see the seal and the start of the wording. The wording is basically going to face Highway 29 so folks going up and down the road will be able to read it. The tank is basically that color and the letters will be in green and the seal will be in black. Any questions about that?"

Commissioner Satterfield asked "Why not put Caswell County Industrial Park instead of Pelham Industrial Park?" Mr. Howard responded "The Caswell Industrial Park is the one here in Yanceyville. That one has always been named Pelham Industrial Park since I have been here." Commissioner Satterfield continued "When the public looks at it and they will see Pelham, I don't know if they will realize that is a Caswell County Industrial Park or not." Commissioner Lucas responded "It is located in Pelham."

Yanceyville Town Council Meeting Date

Mr. Howard stated "The next item I have is the possible meeting dates for the Town of Yanceyville Council."

The Board agreed to be able to meet with the Town of Yanceyville Council on Wednesday, January 25, 2012 at 6:00 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Jefferies asked "On Social Services, did you get a call about a client that needs special funding?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir."

Chairman Hall asked "Mr. Manager when we approved the agenda we approved a Closed Session for Attorney/Client privileges, do we need to go back to include a Closed Session for personnel?" Mr. Howard responded "If you want to do personnel as well, yes sir." Chairman Hall asked "Do you have some information for us?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir."

CLOSED SESSION

Chairman Lucas moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis that the Board enter into Closed Session to consider the compensation, terms of appointment and performance of an individual public officer (NCGS 143-318.11(a)(6) and to preserve the Attorney/Client privilege (NCGS 143-318.11(a)(3)). The motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR SESSION

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to resume regular session. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Howard reminded the Board about the meeting on Thursday, January 19, 2012 to appoint a new county commissioner. Mr. Ferrell asked if the Board needed him to be at the meeting. Chairman Hall told him that he did not need to be there but he did ask if he would send the Board the process to follow for the meeting.

Commissioner Satterfield asked if the Board would be re-addressing previous votes. Chairman Hall responded that this would be under the recommendation of counsel.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:45 p.m. Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Carter to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

Paula P. Seamster
Clerk to the Board

Nathaniel Hall
Chairman
